REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed May 19, 2006.

In the Office Action, claims 1-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,318 B1) in view of Minborg et al., US patent 6,922,721 B1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

I.   Independent claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites:

> responsive to the first request for content, sending to the mobile device an address of the requested content in a reference format;
>
> receiving a second request from the mobile device for the content subsequent to the first request for content, the second request received from the mobile device being different from the first request received from the mobile device, the second request specifying an address of the requested content and a type of the mobile device;

The primary reference to Hawkins et al. do not teach receiving a second request from the mobile device for the requested content, as acknowledged in the outstanding and previous Office Actions. It falls, therefore, to the secondary reference to teach or to suggest the claimed subject matter. Failing such, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection must be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Minborg et al. do not teach or suggest, whether considered alone or in combination with Hawkins et al., receiving the first and second requests as claimed. That Hawkins et al. fails to do so has already been established (and acknowledged by the Office). Note the definite article "the", in the recitation "the second request specifying an address of the requested content". This definite article, therefore, refers to the same "requested content" as the first request from content received from the mobile device.

2

OID-2001-028-01

Serial No. 09/905,117
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5769

In contrast, Minborg et al. teach for a telephone to display "data objects" responsive to triggering events. The data objects are pre-created by the user, and stored in a database. Thereafter, responsive to a triggering event (such as placing a person on hold), the mobile device displays a selected data object. For example, Minborg et al.'s Fig. 5 shows a number of different data objects 502, 504, 506 and 508. These are Paul's data objects, designed to be displayed on Paul's mobile device upon the occurrence of certain trigger events. For example, when Bob calls Paul, data object 502 is displayed on Paul's mobile device. When Paul puts Bob on hold, Paul's mobile device displays data object 504. When Paul re-establishes the call with Bob, Paul's mobile device displays data object 554 and when Paul finishes the call with Bob, Paul's mobile device displays data object 518.

These data objects, the requests for such data objects and the display of such data objects have <u>nothing</u> to do with the original request for content recited in claim 1. Instead, the data objects are pre-created, pre-stored audio-visual files that are created by the user (Col. 7, lines 7-10, Col. 10, lines 55-57), stored in the data server 150 transferred to a subscriber upon occurrence of a triggering event (Col. 10, line 58-61) and rendered on a mobile device during a call (Col. 10, lines 61-63). From the point of view of the user device, the user device receives the data objects (all of them – so that they will be available to the user device upon occurrence of a trigger event), stores the data objects in its local memory and retrieves the appropriate data object from local memory upon occurrence of a trigger event – see Col. 13, lines 1-20.

Fig. 13 of Minborg et al. and Col. 13, lines 22-30 detail an alternative method of obtaining the data objects. Indeed, upon the user's device determining that a triggering event has occurred, the user device sends a data object request to the data server (step 1302, 1304). In step 1306, the user device receives the requested data object from the data server and renders it at step 1308. One

3

request – one receipt of requested data.

The request for a data object is NOT a step of:

> **receiving a second request from the mobile device for the content subsequent to the first request for content, the second request received from the mobile device being different from the first request received from the mobile device, the second request specifying an address of the requested content and a type of the mobile device;**

In Minborg et al., the request for a data object is NOT a "second request from the mobile device for **the** content" – that is, the same content that was the subject of the first claimed request, as required by claim 1. Moreover, the request for a data object does NOT specify "an address of **the** requested content", as again required by claim 1.

It is to be noted that neither Hawkins et al., nor Minborg et al., teach or suggest a first and a second request for the same content, as required by the claims:

Hawkins et al. do not teach the claimed steps of receiving the first and second requests from the mobile device. The Hawkins et al. method, as discussed in Columns 13 and 14 as well as Fig. 2, calls for three phases: a distributed web site process, a query process and a response process. The distributed web site process calls for an application to be created to handle requests from mobile devices. Hawkins et al. teach that an application is created for each web site. This allows some static content to be pre-stored on the mobile device and the dynamic portion of the web site to be downloaded to the mobile device upon request. The query process is the second of the three phases. In this phase, the user fills out a query form and submits the form, which initiates the wireless CTP query to the proxy server 180. The proxy server 180 converts the CTP query to HTTP format and forwards the converted query to the web server 140, which completes the query phase. Note the absence of any step in which a second request for content is received

4

from the mobile device. The response phase (described beginning at Col. 14, line 59) includes the proxy server converting the web server's response into a query response 107, which is then transmitted over the private wireless network 172 to the mobile device, which then incorporates the received response data (the dynamic portion of the requested web site) into the static portion of the web site pre-loaded into the mobile device (see Col. 13, lines 1-9).

Minborg et al., teach a method by which a request for a data object (which is totally unrelated to any other request for content) is satisfied by a single request:

> FIG. 14 shows corresponding procedures performed in a data object server (such as data object server 150) in response to the procedures shown in FIG. 13. Namely, in step 1402, the data server receives a request for a data object (or objects). ... The data server retrieves the data object in step 1404. The request received in step 1402 may also include an indication of a user device display capability. ... In this case, the data server complies with the request by retrieving the data object having the correct format. The data server sends the data object in step 1408.

Note that this is the very passage of Minborg et al. pointed to by the Office in support of the §103(a) rejection. Kindle also note that Minborg et al. teach that a single request is effective to provide the user device with the requested data object. In contrast, the claimed inventions require both a first request and a second request for the same content. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art, even in full possession of the combination of Hawkins et al. and Minborg et al., would not find the claimed embodiment to be obvious, as neither reference, whether considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed first and second requests.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims are, therefore, respectfully requested.

II.   **Independent claim 20**

5

Independent claim 20 recites:

> a first proxy server configured to receive a second request from the mobile device for the content, the second request received from the mobile device being different from the first request received from the mobile device, the second request including the address of the requested content in the reference format and a type of the mobile device, to fetch the content at the received address responsive only the second request only, to convert the fetched content from the reference format to a format suitable to the type of mobile device and to deliver the converted content to the mobile device.

Kindly note that claim 20 includes the recitation "a second request from the mobile device for the content" and "the second request including the address of the requested content", as does independent claim 1. Therefore, the arguments advanced relative to claim 1 are equally applicable to independent claim 20. As such the above arguments are incorporated herein by reference as if repeated here in full. Independent claim 20, therefore, is believed to be allowable for the same reasons as is independent claim 1.

Regarding both the rejections of independent claims 1 and 20, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Hawkins et al. and Minborg et al. would not teach the claimed embodiments. Rather, a person of ordinary skill in this art in full possession of both references would only be motivated to modify Hawkins et al. by providing Hawkins et al. with the ability to display pre-stored images, sounds and/or video files (the so-called data objects of Fig. 5) that would be displayed or otherwise rendered on a mobile device upon the occurrence of a trigger event, which is not a feature that is claimed herein. Missing and wholly unsuggested from such a combination are the methods and computer systems claimed herein, for the reasons advanced above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of claim 20 and its dependent claims are, therefore, respectfully requested.

It is believed that the arguments presented in this Response overcome the outstanding rejections and places this application in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests

6

Serial No. 09/905,117
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5769

that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any further questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, he need only call the undersigned, and whatever is needed will be done immediately.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _August 21, 2006_   By: _____
                                      Alan W. Young,
                                      Attorney for Applicant
                                      Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232

C:\YLF\CLIENTS\ORCL\5769\5769 AMEND.5.doc

7

Serial No. 09/905,117
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5769